Date: Wed, 15 Jun 94 04:30:08 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #665
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Wed, 15 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 665

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 07:24:15 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
Subject: 1750-meter info?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2tki4b$sja@newshost.lanl.gov> chris.pearcy@hyperion.lanl.gov (Chris
Pearcy) writes:
>Does anyone have info on the "no-license-required" 1750-meter band
>(160-190 kHz) or the Panaxis CW transceiver kit for that band? Are
>there many hobbyists on the band? Thanks.

The ARRL email server has a file devoted to this band. Send an email
to: info@arrl.org and only write:
index
quit
and you'll receive a very long list of available files. Look for the
1750M file and order it according to the instruction.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 94 05:42:39 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!netcomsv!
skyld!jangus@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: FM not working in car radio
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <2tlqhb$dhv@nntp2.Stanford.EDU> ehle@leland.Stanford.EDU writes:

> I'm a complete non-radio, non-car person but have a frustrating
> problem with the radio in my '91 VW Jetta:
>
> The FM stations fade out as the temperature cools off. First thing in
> the morning, I get no FM at all. AM's fine. After the car's been
> sitting in the sun all day, the FM comes back. If it's been a cool
> day, or the car's been in the shade, the signal is weak.
>
> Can anyone tell me what's wrong and how much it's going to cost. I
> read none of the newsgroups I'm posting to, so I'd appreciate
> responses directly to my e-mail. Many thanks.

Best guess based on what little you've told me.

You have a windsheild antenna. It has a break in it. As the windshied warms up, the break is bridged and the signal magically appears. The cost to repear this is either a simple reseating of the connection point at the base (usually) of the windshield or could go as far as having to replace the entire windshield assembly.

But it definately sounds like a temperature (i.e. expand/contract) related problem.

Please let me know what you find out. I like to know when I guess correctly!

 Amateur: WA6FWI@WA6FWI.#SOCA.CA.USA.NOAM | "You have a flair for adding
Internet: jangus@skyld.grendel.com | a fanciful dimension to any
 US Mail: PO Box 4425 Carson, CA 90749 | story."
   Phone: 1 (310) 324-6080 | Peking Noodle Co.

Date: 15 Jun 94 10:54:25 GMT

From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Ham Radio Costs at FCC
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Gary Coffman wrote:
> We're *not* a big sink to the FCC. They spend on average 8 manhours a
> week on the amateur service. It's the cheapest to administer service
> that they regulate.

Let's get a few things straight ! Entering the ham license info into the computer at Gettysburg may only require 8 staff hours a week (probably not a man). BUT.....

1) Who buys the paper / pays the postage / etc. ? Who DONATED their new computer ? Is there a supervisor ?
2) Do the FCC/Washington people like W3BE and secretary and maybe an assistant DONATE their time? I thought they were paid. Someone has to handle the rulemaking petitions and other harassment from the hams at large. Or maybe you want this activity delegated to the ARRL...who would doubtless do it for free (NOT!) ;-)
3) Do the government people who go to the international allocations meetings and fend off a certain number of threats to the bands DONATE their time?
4) Etc.

Thinking that amateur radio costs the taxpayer no more than the salary of one nice lady who types in the license info one day a week is like thinking that the only cost in a broadcasting station is the on-air people. You DO work for free, don't you Gary ?

73 de Bob w3otc@amsat.org

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 94 03:00:19 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!rsiatl!jgd@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: VHF Maritime Outrage!!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

n1gak@netcom.com (Scott Statton) writes:

>This is probably an unpopular sentiment, but here goes:
>AFAIK the US is the ONLY nation that charges $0.00 for a life-time
>amateur license.

>If kicking in a pittance every year (and, face it, genetlpersons, $7
>per annum is NOT a huge sum of money .. less than 2 cents per day;
>heck, I lose that much behind the sofa) will warm the cockles/coffers
>of our government, and maybe make them just a TEENY bit more

>responsive to us, then it's a good thing.

Hmm. If how much we pay an agency determines how responsive they are,
we each should have our very own little IRS agent as our personal slaves....

>Remember: The amateur service is a big sink to the FCC ... we provide
>nothing of significant value any more, and we're sitting on hundreds
>of megahertz of valuable bandwidth.

>How many licensed hams are there in the US now? 200,000 maybe? At $7
>per ham per year, we're paying merely $1,400,000 p.a. rent on a LOT of
>real estate...

Whoa, Batman. This presumes the FCC has some sort of title to the radio
spectrum to dole out to the highest bidder. Funny, I can't find any
constitutional authority for that. In the FCC's charter to regulate
the spectrum, it could make a case that the greatest good is for the
amateur frequencies to be used elsewhere but they certainly can't make
a case for selling the frequencies. That they now do so is a
testament to apathetic the population has become.

>P.S. This really kinda goes against my nature -- I'm usually a rabid
>libertarian.

Boy, you dropped it on this one.

John

--
John De Armond, WD4OQC, Marietta, GA   jgd@dixie.com
Performance Engineering Magazine. Email to me published at my sole discretion
Clinton at Normandy for D-day is worse than Hitler presiding over the
Holocaust Museum.

Date: Wed, 15 Jun 1994 07:16:37 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <Cr9Kyq.EwG@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <CrBrC4.Fn9@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<hk1NH1l.edellers@delphi.com>
Subject : Re: End of `440 in SoCal' thread (was: VHF Maritime Outrage!!)

In article <hk1NH1l.edellers@delphi.com> Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:
>

>Are FM transceivers for those bands as readily available as those for 440?

No. But you know by now that I would always encourage someone to build
rather than buy. ``Keep the soldering iron hot and the fingers cool.''

>Is "homebrewing" as practical on those bands as on 440 -- referring to
>special construction techniques as well as availability of components that can
>operate at those higher frequencies?

I see lots of construction articles in the magazines and books; my '91 Hand-
book has a chapter devoted to `UHF and Microwave Equipment', and I believe
the ARRL has entire books devoted to these subjects. Possibly critical
componenets can be gotten from the surplus market. I read that construction
techniques are quite different `up there' than what we're used to on the
lower bands (i.e. 2M). I've heard that it helps to know voo-doo...

>Are propagation characteristics on those bands such that they are as suitable
>for FM voice communication as is 440?

Good question. I'm curious as to what 420-450 characteristics are lost at
the higher frequencies. Why wouldn't they be suitable replacements for
VHF? I imagine there's more shadows in high building density areas; less
refraction, more reflection. Radio waves start behaving more like light.
I'm hoping someone will point out the critical differences.

Jeff NH6IL
(when it comes to building, 10M is UHF to me...)

Date: Tue, 14 Jun 1994 15:32:50 GMT
From: psinntp!arrl.org!zlau@uunet.uu.net
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2td3t2$6gd@ccnet.ccnet.com>, <Cr9Kyq.EwG@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<2ti78m$q4l@abyss.West.Sun.COM>
Subject : Re: Microwave bands (was Re: End of `440 in SoCal' thread)

Dana Myers (myers@bigboy.West.Sun.COM) wrote:

: Procuring parts and building working gear for microwave bands is
: considerably more difficult than building 80m transmitters out
: of junk televisions. I agree amateurs should indeed get involved
: on these bands, but these bands are not necessarily valid replacement
: spectrum for the functions filled by 2m, 70cm, 33cm and 23cm.

I guess this is pretty obvious is you already *know* how to

build radios out of TVs. But, if you don't have this background,
I'm not sure how true this really is. I suspect a lot of
amateurs can no longer tell you what the specialty ICs are
used in various consumer electronics really do, much less rewire
them up in amateur applications.

On the other hand, surplus microwave stuff is often more straightforward
to deal with. You can often figure out what frequency the stuff operates
with a ruler (if it isn't marked on the case). Much of the circuitry is
still discretes, or at least nice understandable building blocks, often
with 50 ohm input and output connections. Thus, some modifications
consisist of merely tearing out all the junk you don't need, and hooking
up what you do need.

True, getting 10 watt transistors is still a challenge on most of the
microwave bands. But, low power microwave parts are relatively easy
to get and getting easier, as companies realize they have to actually
sell stuff to stay in business.

--
Zack Lau KH6CP/1
Internet: zlau@arrl.org

2 way QRP WAS
8 States on 10 GHz
10 grids on 2304 MHz

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #665
****